

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is requested to allow Claims 30-48, the only claims pending and under examination in this application.

Claims 1-29 have been cancelled without prejudice.

New Claims 30-48 have been added. Support for the new claims is found throughout the specification and claims as originally filed, for example, in original Claims 1-29; at page 2, line 34 to page 3, line 1; page 4, lines 7-8; page 6, lines 27-29; page 7, lines 23-26; and FIG. 3. No new matter is added.

Specification

The Abstract was objected to for not complying with MPEP § 608.01(b) for reciting phrases that may be implied. Office Action, pg. 2, ¶ 4. As indicated above, the Abstract has been amended. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must refer to the other claims in the alternative only.

In addition, Claims 4-8, 13-16, 21-26 and 29 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim may not depend from another multiple dependent claim.

The Examiner also objected to the use of the phrase “comprising of” in Claims 1, 9 and 27.

As indicated above, Claims 1-29 have been cancelled without prejudice. As such, these objections are rendered moot, and the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these objections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 2000-345124 A (hereinafter “JP ‘124”).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631; 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The standard for anticipation under section 102 is one of strict identity. An anticipation rejection requires a showing that each limitation of a claim be found in a single reference. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 224 U.S.P.Q. 409, 411 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Further, an anticipatory reference must be enabling, so as to place one of ordinary skill in possession of the claimed invention. See *Akzo N.V. v. United States Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 808 F.2d 1471, 1479, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 482 U.S. 909 (1987). To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every feature of the claimed invention, either explicitly or inherently. *Glaxo v. Novopharm, Ltd.*, 334 U.S.P.Q.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

As indicated above, Claims 1-29 have been cancelled without prejudice. As such, this rejection is rendered moot, and the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Additionally, the Examiner noted that original Claims 12 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Furthermore, the Examiner stated that, “The prior art neither teaches nor suggests the claimed invention including the paint-repellent layer.” Office Action, pg. 9, ¶ 15.

New independent Claims 30, 33 and 46 have been added by way of amendment. Each of these new claims includes the element that the carrier comprises a paint-repellent layer. As stated by the Examiner, “The prior art neither

teaches nor suggests the claimed invention including the paint-repellent layer.”
Claims 31-32, 34-45 and 47-48 depend from independent Claims 30, 33 and 46, respectively. As such, the Applicants submit that new Claims 30-48 are allowable over JP ‘124.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 17, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over JP ‘124, in view of JP 60-011338 A (hereinafter “JP ‘338”).

As indicated above, Claims 1-29 have been cancelled without prejudice. As such, this rejection is rendered moot, and the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In addition, the Examiner indicated that, “The prior art neither teaches nor suggests the claimed invention including the paint-repellent layer.” Office Action, pg. 9, ¶ 15. New independent Claims 30, 33 and 46 have been added by way of amendment. Each of these new claims includes the element that the carrier comprises a paint-repellent layer. Claims 31-32, 34-45 and 47-48 depend from independent Claims 30, 33 and 46, respectively. Consequently, the Applicants submit that new Claims 30-48 are allowable over JP ‘124, in view of JP ‘338.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, please telephone Bret Field at (650) 327-3400.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0815.

Respectfully submitted,
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: May 26, 2009

By: /Rudy J. Ng., Reg. No. 56,741/
Rudy J. Ng
Registration No. 56,741

Date: May 26, 2009

By: /Bret E. Field, Reg. No. 37,620/
Bret E. Field
Registration No. 37,620

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
1900 University Ave., Suite 200
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone (650) 327-3400
Facsimile (650) 327-3231